THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

October 16, 1984

AM 10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of next meetings: November 14, 1984, Wednesday
December 12, 1984, Wednesday

B. Approval of September 12, 1984 minutes of the Commission of Fine Arts.

II. SUBMISSION AND REVIEWS

A. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

1. CFA 16/OCT/84-1, Pennsylvania Building, 13th & E Streets, N.W., Proposed facade alterations and additional stories.

2. CFA 16/OCT/84-2, Indiana Plaza, Final design details and landscape materials.

B. Smithsonian Institution, National Zoological Park

1. CFA 16/OCT/84-3, Phase I, Final design details and landscape materials.

2. CFA 16/OCT/84-4, Gibbon Exhibit, preliminary designs for new exhibit.

C. Department of State

CFA 16/OCT/84-5, Security measures at main building of Department of State pedestrian entrances; 22nd and C Streets, N.W.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS CONTINUED, October 16, 1984

D. National Park Service, National Capital Region

1. CFA 16/OCT/84-6, Anacostia Metro Station Parking Garage, Anacostia Park, S.E., Joint submission with Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority.

2. CFA 16/OCT/84-7, German American Friendship Garden, revised drawing.

3. CFA 16/OCT/84-10, Vietnam Veterans Memorial, Post and chain visitors control.

4. CFA 16/OCT/84-11, Vietnam Veterans Memorial, Statuary group, progress report.

E. Department of the Navy, Chesapeake Division

1. CFA 16/OCT/84-8, Marine Barracks, 8th and E Streets, S.E., Installation of a covered walkway between buildings 8 & 9.

2. CFA 16/OCT/84-9, Naval Research Laboratory

   a. Electro-Magnetic Development Laboratory
   b. Electro-Optics Laboratory
   c. Mission Operations Support Center

F. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

Shipstead-Luce Act

1. S.L. 84-84, 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Proposed sidewalk cafe for Marriott Hotel at 14th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

2. S.L. 85-03, 2130 Cathedral Avenue, N.W., Three-story single family rowhouse, concept.

Appendix I.

Old Georgetown Act

1. O.G. 84-197, 3800 Reservoir Road, N.W., Georgetown University, University Center, concept designs.

II. SUBMISSION AND REVIEWS CONTINUED, October 16, 1984

2. O.G. 84-260, 2809 P Street, N.W., Proposed new residence, concept designs, resubmission of additional details.

Appendix II.

G. Department of the Treasury, U.S. Mint

1. CFA 16/OCT/84-12, Elie Wiesel Medal, designs.

2. CFA 16/OCT/84-13, Roy Wilkins Medal, designs.

ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

I. ADMINISTRATION

C. Whitehurst Freeway alternative

Comment by Mr. Netsch on change in materials used on Georgetown Harbour project: This was brought up during the Submissions & Reviews section of the meeting, after II. A. 2., Indiana Plaza.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

D. National Park Service, National Capital Region

5. CFA 16/OCT/84-14, Marine Corps Memorial, addition of names and dates.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 84-234	3207 O Street, N.W. Cohen & Associates	Sign

ACTION: Issue permit for wall mounted aluminum sign as shown on drawings received and dated 18 September 1984.

---

*O.G. 84-244	3270 M Street, N.W. Georgetown Park II Associates	New commercial building

ACTION: See attached letter to Carol B. Thompson, dated September 14, 1984. Returned for further study.

---

*O.G. 84-245 (Conceptual)	3270 M Street, N.W. Georgetown Park II Associates	Demolition

ACTION: Issue permit for razing. Structure has no know architectural or historic merits and does not contribute to historic district.

O.G. 84-247	3251 R Street, N.W. Mr. & Mrs. Wallace F. Holladay	Second story addition

ACTION: Issue permit for alterations and additions as shown on drawings received and dated 13 September 1984. Note change to elevation drawing marked in red ink.

---

*O.G. 84-249 (Conceptual)	3031 O Street, N.W. Fenton Properties	New curb cut & garage

ACTION: Do not issue permit for new curb cut or for cutting garage door through facade of mid-nineteenth century house. Proposal would have an adverse effect on this architecturally significant house and on the historic streetscape.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 84-253	1640 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Wynmark Dev.	Iron fencing

ACTION: VOID. Withdrawn by applicant.

O.G. 84-256	1227 34th Street, N.W. George I. Borger	Roof AC unit

ACTION: Issue permit for roof-mounted air-conditioning unit.

O.G. 84-257	1519 35th Street, N.W. Mary Jean Evans	Replace existing stone retaining wall

ACTION: Recommend against razing or removing stonewall; existing wall contributes to character of Historic District. Removal of major tree(s) is also not recommended. Proposed fence, together with retaining wall, should be no higher than 7'-0".

O.G. 84-258	2901 M Street, N.W. L.B. Doggett	Parking lot gate

ACTION: Issue permit for automated parking lot gate as shown on drawings received and dated 14 September 1984. Note that electronic card box will not be attached to the existing brick pier at entrance.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 84-254	1408 35th Street, N.W. Mrs. Nan McEvoy	Swimming pool

ACTION: Issue permit for swimming pool as shown on drawings received and dated 3 October 1984.

O.G. 84-261	1231 34th Street, N.W. George I. Borger	Roof mounted air-conditioning equipment

ACTION: Issue permit. Proposed equipment will not be visible from public space.

O.G. 84-262	1010 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. 1010 Potomac Associates	Flagpoles

ACTION: Do not issue permit. No objection to concept of flagpoles. Recommend less conspicuous location on building and submittal of accurate data concerning materials, height and installation of poles.

O.G. 84-263	1610 32nd Street, N.W. Thomas E. Carroll	Breakfast room addition

ACTION: Issue permit for breakfast room addition as shown on drawings received and dated 21 September 1984.

O.G. 84-264	3411 Dent Street, N.W. Kevin Schlosberg	Swimming pool

ACTION: Issue permit for proposed swimming pool as shown on drawings received and dated 21 September 1984.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 84-266	3502-3516 Winfield Lane, N.W. Dunn/Brady Associates	Temporary sign

ACTION: Issue permit for temporary sign as shown on drawing received and dated 28 September 1984. Sign to be removed prior to one year from date of this action.

O.G. 85-01	3108 M Street, N.W. Iraklis Karabassis	Commercial renovation

ACTION: Issue permit for Scheme number four(4) as shown on drawing received and dated 1 October 1984.

O.G. 85-02	3310 M Street, N.W. John W. Cassell	Glass and wood sign

ACTION: Issue permit for internally-illuminated glass and wood sign as shown on drawings received and dated 1 October 1984.

O.G. 85-03	1517 30th Street, N.W. Seventh Commerce Properties Corporation	Awnings

ACTION: Issue permit for beige-colored vinyl awnings as shown on drawings received and dated 2 October 1984. Recommend that each doorway have its own separate awning rather than one shared in common. See revised drawings.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
*S.L. 84-67	1435 G Street, N.W. Perpetual American Bank, FSB	Renovation & addition

ACTION: Concept approved for new 11th floor addition to office building, subject to review and approval of material samples and working drawing by Commission of Fine Arts. Recommend additional articulation of top banding and decorative corner elements and less emphasis on new keystones.

---

*S.L. 84-79	2520 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Government of Japan	Addition

ACTION: Issue permit.

---

*S.L. 84-80	758 Jackson Place, N.W. National Trust for Historic Preservation	Door replacement, sign & awning

ACTION: Issue permit.

---

*S.L. 84-83	2300 N Street, N.W. Office Joint Venture	New office building

ACTION: Concept approved for new office building. Recommend additional consideration of relation of brick to limestone on facades.

S.L. 84-87	2331 Calvert Street, N.W. Calvert Park Associates	Renovation & alteration

ACTION: Issue permit for renovation and alteration as shown on drawing received and dated 25 September 1984. Note remarks shown in red ink agreed upon by applicant.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 84-86	739 15th Street, N.W. Chris Keshishian	Sign

ACTION: No objection to change of text and color of existing sign.

S.L. 85-01	2116 F Street, N.W. Richard D. Bernstein	Sideyard alterations

ACTION: Issue permit for sideyard alterations as shown on drawings received and dated 9 October 1984.

---

*S.L. 85-04	2500 Calvert Street, N.W. Shoreham Hotel Limited Partnership	Realignment of garage

ACTION: No objection to concept of proposed below grade realignment of garage as shown on drawing received and dated 10/10/84. Note previous approval (S.L. 84-65).

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED • BY • CONGRESS • MAY • 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS TOUR, October 15, 1984, 1:00 p.m.

Depart Commission offices, 708 Jackson Place, N.W.

Department of State Main Building, via Virginia Avenue past Federal Reserve Buildings to view landscape and first floor infill at new building. At State inspect site for pedestrian entrance security measures.

Harry Thompson Boat Center on Potomac River and Rock Creek to view Georgetown Waterfront; Rossyln, VA.; Kennedy Center, Watergate, etc.

Georgetown Waterfront via K Street past recently reviewed projects and proposed park site. Up Wisconsin Avenue and west on M Street to Georgetown Market and Georgetown Park Phase II site. Georgetown University and various project sites.

Up Rock Creek Parkway to International Center, District of Columbia University and INTELSAT Building via Tilden Street.

National Zoological Park via Connecticut Avenue, tour of lower end of park.

Massachusetts Avenue to 8th Street, N.W., past Convention Center, Techworld site, down 7th Street.

Cross Mall past sculpture garden on 7th Street to Smithsonian Castle and Quadrangle Project. Pass Calder sculpture and German American Garden site.

Arlington Cemetery, Custis-Lee Mansion, and L'Enfant's Tomb past Washington Monument, Lincoln Memorial.

Return to Washington past the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, and Signers Memorial with optional stop at The Octagon for the opening reception of "CHICAGO AND NEW YORK: MORE THAN A CENTURY OF ARCHITECTURAL INTERACTION," from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

16 October 1984

The meeting was convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Members present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Sondra G. Myers Hon. Walter A. Netsch Hon. Alan R. Novak Hon. Edward D. Stone, Jr.
Staff present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue Kohler
National Capital Planning Commission staff present:	Pam Johnson

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of next meetings, approved as: 14 November 1984, Wednesday
12 December 1984, Wednesday

B. Minutes of the 12 September 1984 meeting, approved.

C. Whitehurst Freeway report. (This item was not on the printed agenda.) Before the first submission was discussed, Mr. Novak asked to comment on another solution for the Whitehurst Freeway problem. He said the president of the Business and Professional Association of Georgetown had showed him a "cut and cover" scheme which seemed to have merit, and although the city government had said it was too late to consider any further alternatives, Mr. Novak said he wanted to make the members aware of it, and asked the Chairman if the Commission could look at the drawings. The Chairman said the city would need the Commission's approval of whatever plan was accepted, and he saw no reason why the new alternative

could not be examined. The Secretary agreed, and Mr. Netsch said he thought the only requirement was that the city be made aware the Commission was looking at another scheme.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

1. CFA 16/OCT/84-1, Pennsylvania Building, 13th & E Streets, N. W.; Proposed facade alterations and additional stories. The Assistant Secretary showed a photograph of this building and said that there would be interior renovation, a new facade, and increased height. He then introduced James Rich of PADC to make the presentation. Mr. Rich noted the importance of the site and the high visibility of the building from the western end of the avenue, and then turned the architectural discussion over to Bob Smith of Smith, Segretti and Tepper, architects. Mr. Smith showed slides of other buildings in the area, noting that they were characterized in general by strong bases and some distinctive architectural features in the attic stories. He said the Pennsylvania Building was built in 1954, and with its horizontal banding of blue-green windows, was not harmonious with its neighbors. He also noted the adjacent new building, 1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, which is considerably higher. Mr. Smith said he thought the new limestone skin, with its vertical and symmetrical window pattern, would be a more fitting termination for Western Plaza than the one existing. He showed views looking east on the avenue with the new exterior in place to show the effect it would have. There would be some increase in height and the top floors would come out to the property line, unlike the present configuration. There would be a curve at the Pennsylvania Avenue and Thirteenth Street corner, making the two facades read as one. There was a strong, centrally-placed entrance feature on 13th Street, and Mr. Netsch noted that this would stress the straight east-west axis, rather than the diagonal of Pennsylvania Avenue. He also said he was not really pleased with the grouping of round arched windows on the upper floors and wondered if rectangular windows would look better. The Chairman indicated that he, too, was bothered by this but was not sure what the solution was. In general, the members were pleased with the design, and Mr. Rich said that the upper windows would be restudied.

Exhibit A

2. CFA 16/OCT/84-2, Indiana Plaza, final design details and landscape materials. Staff member Jeffrey Carson recalled that the preliminary drawings had been approved in May and said the final drawings, a listing of landscape materials, and a model of a section of the proposed granite seat wall had been submitted for review at this meeting. He noted that there had been some further study of the area around the GAR monument and Temperance fountain and then introduced Robert Sprowls from PADC. Mr. Sprowls showed a plan of the area, pointing out the large circular area around the GAR monument and the

entrances to it at its eastern end and from Pennsylvania and Indiana avenues, where the openings in the surrounding granite planter wall were set perpendicular to the avenues. Entrance piers would borrow their mouldings from the GAR monument, and lighting standards shown on the piers were reminiscent of the Civil War period with clusters of round globes. Inside the circle, the granite walls would form seats, and there was a star-shaped medallion type paving pattern around the GAR monument with "ribbons" from the medallion, of brick and granite paving, running between the two 19th century landmark buildings just to the east. The Temperance Fountain was placed to the north, along 7th Street, to call attention to the art galleries and studios there. Planting of Magnolia stellata were shown outside the circular wall, with honey locusts bordering the walk between the two old buildings.

The members were pleased with the design and had only one comment: both the Chairman and Mr. Netsch thought the form of the granite seats was too stark and angular for a Victorian setting. They thought perhaps a simple moulding at the back and seat edges, or a curved rather than right angle joining of back and seat might be more appropriate. Mr. Sprowls said he would suggest further study of this element. With this recommendation the final plans were unanimously approved.

Exhibit B

Mr. Netsch then asked what was happening with plans for the completion of Western Plaza. He said that it looked very barren and thought some large trees would provide needed vertical emphasis and welcome shade. He noted that the flagpoles were not in the same position as the original pylons, and with their placement a new direction had begun in the design of the plaza. Mr. Sprowls said the area was still being studied.

Georgetown Harbour Project, 3020 K Street, N. W. A discussion of this item was not on the agenda, but at this point in the meeting Mr. Netsch said he would like to comment on the change in materials on this project, noticed when the members toured the city the day before the meeting. He said that much of the limestone seemed to have been changed to two shades of grey-brown brick. He thought it was important to note this in light of the material sample review expected for the adjacent hotel, and he thought the Park Service should be made aware of it.

B. Smithsonian Institution, National Zoological Park

1. CFA 16/OCT/84-3, Phase I, final design details and landscape materials. Mr. Carson said these final details were for Phase I, and would include the landscaping of the entrance near Rock Creek Parkway and about half the Olmsted Walk alterations and upgrading--as far as the parking structure. He introduced George Calese, acting director of the Zoo, who noted first that Dr. Michael Robinson had been selected as the

new director, and then, in regard to this project, said that the work had been done by the Zoo's design staff and by EDAW, landscape architects. Faye Harwell from EDAW made the presentation. She discussed the Rock Creek entrance modifications first, noting that this was a gathering place for people as they came from the parking area, and there would be kiosks, benches, pools and a bridge--all elements the Commission had seen during the preliminary presentation. She then said that the canopy of trees along the Olmsted Walk would include sycamores and red maples and would be consistent with what is there at present. The walk itself would be 26 feet wide with concrete curbs; walk material would be asphalt block at the entrance and, for budgetary reasons, asphalt the rest of the way. There would be a red brick line running through the length of the walk to lead people and give continuity. The members made several comments on the proposals. Mr. Netsch noted, first, the recent change in zoo design--from architectonic to environmental--and said he liked the idea of the tree canopy following the walk, but was not certain the mixture of trees would result in a true canopy. Mr. Stone said aerial photographs would help give a feel for how the canopy would look. He also questioned the use of asphalt for surfacing the walk, feeling that this was not a high enough quality surface to use throughout the National Zoo. He thought that the site required some modular material; that asphalt block (Hastings block) would be acceptable, and that the red brick line should be omitted. The other members agreed and said they would rather see only half as much of the walk paved during this phase, if money was really a problem. The other elements in the design were unanimously approved, but it was requested that the walk design be resubmitted. Exhibit C

2. CFA 16/OCT/84-4, Gibbon exhibit, preliminary designs for new exhibit. Ms. Harwell pointed out the location of this exhibit, noting the existence of a road on the site at present. She said it would be a mesh, tent-like structure in the trees with a core of viewing pavilions and a holding facility partially recessed in the ground. The members had no objection to the concept, but said they needed more detailed information and a three dimensional model before they could make any further comments. Exhibit C

C. Department of State

CFA 16/OCT/84-5, Security measures at main building of Department of State at pedestrian entrances, 22nd and C Streets, N. W. The Secretary informed the members that the major entrances were already protected with "New Jersey" type concrete highway barriers; this proposal was for something more permanent and better looking. Mr. Newell from the State Department said that while security was most important, they

wanted something attractive and had come up with a series of planter boxes as a long term solution to the problem. A representative from GSA stressed the urgency of the project and said they hoped to have it completed by June 1985. It would be a phased project, with the pedestrian entrances taken care of first, followed by attention to areas beyond the building itself. The architect from GSA showed drawings of the proposed granite clad barriers at the C Street entrance, considered the most crucial because of its large open plaza and driveway. The barriers were a minimum of 30 inches high with a maximum of 4 feet between them. They followed the curve of the drive and were filled with plants, the idea being to keep vehicles out but allow people in through a not unfriendly entrance. Mr. Netsch was concerned that the city was getting too many planter/barriers and asked if large diameter trees would serve the same purpose. Mr. Stone suggested a combination of bollards and trees. The representative from GSA said bollards would not be sufficient, nor would trees, and the bollards look like they are to keep people out. The Chairman and Mr. Netsch thought that if the heights were adjusted so that there was a real design to the placement it would become a more positive thing; the Chairman also suggested that the lighting indicated on the drawings be omitted so as not to call any more attention than necessary to the barriers. The Chairman told the representative from GSA that in the interest of saving time he could bring revised designs to the staff for review. The concept of the barriers was unanimously approved with this recommendation. Exhibit D

D. National Park Service, National Capital Region

1. CFA 16/OCT/84-6, Anacostia Metro Station Parking Garage, Anacostia Park, S. E., joint submission with Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority. The Assistant Secretary pointed out the location of this 700-foot-long parking structure on an aerial photograph. It would be on the edge of the river, in a park, on land long used by various agencies and recently turned over to the Park Service. He said the design for the park itself would be submitted later. John Parsons, representing the Park Service, said his agency had been working toward removal of industrial type usages of this land, and several months ago 60 acres that were taken away in the 1920's were returned to the Park Service by the Architect of the Capitol and the District government. He said there will be a Metro station on this property, and a 1500 car parking lot having been rejected by the citizens and local officials, plans were made for a parking structure instead. He said there is a temporary parking lot there now which will stay until the Metro line is extended. The park area will be developed with major sports areas, much like East and West Potomac parks, and Metro will fund

the landscaping around the parking garage. Jeff Knoedler, architect from the Park Service, was introduced; he said it was hoped that the Metro station would be a catalyst for the development of Anacostia Park. He said there were two temporary structures on the site which would remain until the line opened in 1989-90. Community involvement in the project had been encouraged, and the garage had been sited near the freeway to leave more open space for the park. He said a new park entry road would be built, running from Suitland Parkway through the park and out to Anacostia Drive. In response to questioning, Mr. Knoedler said the Navy Yard structures would block any view from the Capitol. The architect for the garage, Harry Weese, was then introduced. He showed a rendering of the design, noted that there would be an adequate number of evergreen trees around the building to screen the view, and said the structure would be of post-tensioned concrete. The top deck would be at a height of 36 feet. Mr. Netsch was concerned about security in the stair towers as there was no way to see into them. Mr. Weese agreed this was a good point and said he would look into a solution--openings or TV cameras or both. Other than this suggestion, there were no objections to the design and it was unanimously approved. Exhibit E

2. CFA 16/OCT/84-7, German American Friendship Garden, revised drawing. Mr. Carson observed that the first submission for this project had been made in September 1983 and the most recent in September 1984. He showed both designs, each featuring perennials, small trees, and water elements, but varying in size and configuration. The September 1984 design was considerably smaller than the original, but when they saw it staked out, the members thought it was still too large and penetrated too deeply into the Washington Monument grounds. Of the several smaller alternatives shown this time, they preferred one marked Alternate #7. Mr. Carson reminded them that the parking lot new existing in the area would be retained, at least temporarily, and its entrance would coincide with the entrance into the garden. Mr. Netsch said the parking lot would have to be altered, and it should be removed when the garden is completed. He was particularly concerned about the type of perennials to be planted; he said he had seen the Federal Reserve gardens designed by James Van Sweden, the landscape architect for this project, and did not want to see a repeat of the tall grasses and the winter appearance of a graden of dried out and dead plantings. He thought plants traditional in other public areas in the Capital should be used. The plan of the garden was unanimously approved, with the proviso of further review of construction details and plant materials. Exhibit F

3. CFA 16/OCT/84-10, Vietnam Veterans Memorial, post and chain visitor control. The Assistant Secretary noted that the members had seen this temporary (and minimal) installation, and they unanimously approved it. Mr. Netsch remarked that he had been pleased to see that the grass had taken hold between the granite sets added to each side of the original walk; he said it had made a big difference in diminishing the impact of this element in the design. The members also commented on the lighting, saying that it was very effective.

4. CFA 16/OCT/84-11, Vietnam Veterans Memorial, statuary group, progress report. The Secretary reported that he had just seen the statue at the foundry in New York. He showed slides, pointing out the different patina used to depict flesh and clothing. He introduced the sculptor, Frederick Hart, who said the refined differentiation in the patina had been worked out very carefully to give special emphasis to the faces of the three figures. He said the effect would be quite realistic and he realized it must be handled carefully. He said the statue would be waxed to maintain the character of the patina, and he hoped there would be a maintenance fund to keep the piece from streaking and discoloring. The members had some misgivings about the effect, and the Chairman said the variation in patina would have to be done very subtly or the abstraction would be lost and the sculpture would resemble a piece in a wax museum. Exhibit G

5. CFA 16/OCT/84-14, Marine Corps Memorial, addition of names. Joseph Ronsisvalle presented this project for the Park Service. He said they were seeking direction from the Commission as to where on the statue base to place the names and dates of two additional Marine Corps engagements--the Dominican Republic and Grenada. Should they be placed vertically, in column form, below "Vietnam" (the last of the names running around the top of the base), or should they run horizontally, beginning a second band at the top? He said the sculptor, Felix de Weldon, preferred the column form, but after looking at a photograph, the members thought that beginning a second band would be better. They asked also that dates to be used for the beginning and end of the Marines' participation in the Vietnam conflict be determined and added at the same time. Exhibit H

E. Department of the Navy, Chesapeake Division

1. CFA 16/OCT/84-8, Marine Barracks, 8th and I Streets, S. E., installation of a covered walkway between buildings 8 & 9. Staff member Sue Kohler showed drawings of this proposed covered walkway, a semicircular aluminum frame with opaque fiberglass panels, that would join the two buildings at the second floor level. She noted that the entire barracks complex was listed on the National Register, with the barracks themselves being individually listed landmarks. They were designed by the Washington firm of Hornblower & Marshall in 1902 and 1906. Because of their National Register status, this federally funded alteration was reviewed by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; it also required review by the D. C. Historic Preservation Officer, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Commission of Fine Arts. She said the Advisory Council and NCPC had approved the walkway, but the Historic Preservation Officer had objected to the materials, finding that the fiberglass panels in particular would have an adverse effect on these landmark buildings. She introduced Frank Gerlach from the Navy; in answer to the members' questions he said the fiberglass would be opaque

because of an insulation backing, and the opacity had seemed desirable from the point of view of nighttime visibility, especially during the Evening Parade ceremony when complete darkness was required. The members agreed with the D. C. Historic Preservation Officer that the fiberglass was not a suitable material and suggested glass--either transparent or translucent. They thought a very low level lighting, perhaps placed along the edge of the floor, would solve the problem of calling attention to the walkway at night; during the Evening Parade the lights could be turned off, as they are throughout the rest of the barracks. There was no objection to the design, but the project was unanimously disapproved on the basis of material selection. Exhibit I

2. CFA 16/OCT/84-9, Naval Research Laboratory

a. Electro-Magnetic Development Laboratory
b. Electro-Optics Laboratory
c. Mission Operations Support Center

The Assistant Secretary again introduced Mr. Gerlach, who told the members that these functions of the research laboratory were now located in old buildings, and since more space was needed, it had been decided to concentrate them in a sparsely developed area on the north side of the laboratory. The project would include an addition to Building 210 and two new buildings. The basic material would be a sandy colored precast concrete, although the Electro-Optics building was shown with a bright red and white facade. While the Commission did not object to the design of the buildings, there was objection to the bright color in this highly visible area. The strongest objections were to the site plan and the landscaping (or lack of it). The buildings seemed to have been just dropped on the site with no concern for their relationship, and the desirable area at the river's edge was devoted to parking. Mr. Stone was firmly of the opinion that nothing should be approved until a site and landscaping plan for the area had been seen; he recalled that the Commission had had the same problem with the development at the Bolling-Anacostia base. The other members agreed with him and the project was disapproved unanimously, pending review of such a plan. Exhibit J

F. District of Columbia Government, Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

Shipstead-Luce Act

1. S.L. 84-84, 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W., proposed sidewalk cafe for Marriott Hotel at 14th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. Temporarily withdrawn.

2. S.L. 85-03, 2130 Cathedral Avenue, N. W., three-story single family rowhouse, concept. Mr. Carson recalled that four years ago the Commission had reviewed another house for this site; this was a completely different design and would be presented by the owner/architect, Erol Adels. Mr. Adels showed drawings of a painted white brick house, in the International Style, as well as several photographs of the existing row in which it would be built. He pointed out that there was little consistency in the design of these houses, except that they were all brick, some whitewashed. He noted the dense foliage, and in answer to the Chairman's question, said the house would be only minimally visible from Rock Creek Park. There were no objections and the project was unanimously approved.

3. Appendix 1, approved.

Old Georgetown Act

1. O.G. 84-197, 3800 Reservoir Road, N. W., Georgetown University, University Center, concept designs. The Assistant Secretary recalled that in April the Commission had seen the master plan for this large project behind the medical center and Healy Hall, and at that time had approved the terraced garage structures. That section of the development projecting above the garages had been pointed out but not reviewed. In May the housing behind Healy Hall had been approved. He said this submission was for the design of one of the above-garage structures, University Center, and noted that the Georgetown Board had seen it on 3 October and given its approval, with some comment on the architectural treatment. He said this was a conceptual review only, and then introduced Theodore Mariani of Mariani and Associates, architects. Mr. Mariani reviewed the project for the members and showed aerial views and slides of the proposed three-stage podium development. Then he turned to a discussion of the uppermost podium, University Center, the subject of the submission for this meeting. He noted on drawings and a model the large arched openings that marked the beginning of this above-garage development. He said the center would include guest facilities, a theatre, bookstore, and a student activities center. These were arranged around the periphery with a lawn and trees in the center and stair towers at the corners. Where possible, photo-voltaic elements formed part of the roof structure.

Mr. Mariani then showed slides of the Healy Building, designed in 1870 by Paul Pelz, noting that this building had been the model for the architectural detailing of the University Center. The center would be constructed of red brick, like the rear of the Healy Building, but unlike the older building, would have a considerable amount of white limestone trim. The Chairman asked how much of this project would be visible, first, from the residential part of Georgetown, and Mr. Mariani said that very little would be seen because the construction would all be lower than the Medical Center buildings. When asked about visibility from the Potomac,

he said it would be seen, the southern-most sections especially. Mr. Netsch questioned the use of the white trim and said that if it were used it should be more delicate; the Chairman said he did not object to the trim and thought it helped break up the mass. Mr. Netsch was also concerned that the plaza areas in this development could easily become very sterile and needed benches and other amenities. Mr. Mariani said these things would come; this presentation was just for conceptual approval. The concept was unanimously approved.

2. O.G. 84-260, 2809 P Street, N. W., proposed new residence concept designs, resubmission of additional details. The Assistant Secretary said this submission was for a new house on a vacant lot between two existing houses. It would be attached to the free-standing house on the west, changing it to a row house. He said the Georgetown Board had reviewed the design twice, and while they had some concern about the height of the house at the rear and had recommended some changes in detailing, they thought the attached house concept was acceptable because it was in an area of row house development. He showed slides of the block as it now exists, locating the proposed site for the house. He also pointed out the historic Dodge house at the corner of 29th and P Streets and the vacant land around it, recalling that about ten years ago the Commission had recommended against development on this land. Michael Minkoff, the developer, was then introduced. He discussed the siting and massing of the house with the aid of a model and said it would resemble the adjoining house in architectural detail; the bricks would be identical and the roof would be lead-coated copper.

Several citizens asked to comment on the project. Donald Harris, a neighbor at 2803 P Street, said he would object to any building on this lot. He observed that the streetscape was a rarity in Georgetown since it had undergone very little change since the mid-nineteenth century. He said the free-standing house and the double houses at the corner of 28th Street had been built in the 1840's by Reuben Daw, who had also built the rifle barrel fence around these properties from surplus rifles purchased just before the Mexican War. He said that construction of the new house would require a break in this historic fence. It would also require a substantial remodeling of the free-standing house (2811 P Street) which has windows on the east side. Additionally, he noted that there were beautiful trees on the lot that would have to come down. In regard to lot division, he said that while there are two separate lots on paper, in actuality no owner has confined himself to one lot and some features of the house at 2811 are on the adjoining lot. He said he did not believe that disapproval of construction on this site would cause economic hardship to the owner of 2811; in fact, he thought building a house on the side lot would reduce the value of his property.

The next speaker was Mrs. David Childs, resident of 2806 P Street; she stressed the importance of the site plan and open space in this block and said it was unique in Georgetown. Mrs. Dean Acheson spoke next,

stating that she had lived at 2805 P Street, next to the proposed new building, for sixty-two years. She emphasized the importance of gardens in the preservation of the character of Georgetown and said it was this kind of thing that the Old Georgetown Act was supposed to protect. She said she believed that greed on the part of developers was destroying the character that had attracted people to Georgetown for so many years.

The last speaker was Donald Shannon, past president of the Citizens Association of Georgetown. He agreed that the problem of filling up open space was a very serious one, and he said that if a house were allowed on this lot, the owners of the Dodge house at 28th and P would request three houses on their property. Mr. Minkoff then asked to reply to some of Mr. Harris's statements. He said the vacant lot had been a recognized subdivision lot for many years, and the only alterations to the house at 2811 would be the closing of two windows opening onto the stairwell--the door would be retained with an entrance through the wall of the new house. He added that the proceeds from the sale of the vacant lot would enable the owner of 2811 to put an addition on his house.

The Chairman then commented on the proposal, saying first that the Commission's special charge in Georgetown was to preserve its historic character. He noted that the commercial area had already been extensively altered, and he said that great care must be used in allowing change in the residential area. Mr. Netsch commented on the uniqueness of the open space in Georgetown, and he said he thought the architect had been very callous in placing the house right at the front of the lot. He said he recognized that the site was a valid building lot but thought the development should be sympathetic to the block--smaller and set back. Mr. Novak said that as a lawyer he saw a collision in this situation between the right to develop one's property and the idea of the public good. He said the Commission could not deal with legal questions but had to consider more vague concepts and get a feel for what was right. Crucial to this case was how special the site was considered. He thought that just looking at the block should be fair warning to any developer; he said the owner must have known it would be difficult to get Commission approval for so large a house on this site. He said he believed the Commission's jurisdiction did extend to situations of this kind. Mrs. Myers said she saw no reason to grant the request, and Mr. Stone said he thought the open space was too important to give up. The Chairman said that in the past the Commission had made decisions independent of zoning right, and it was his opinion that this development was inappropriate to the historic district. The project was unanimously disapproved. Exhibit K

3. Appendix 2, approved.

G. Department of the Treasury, U. S. Mint

1. CFA 16/OCT/84-12, Elie Wiesel Medal, designs.

2. CFA 16/OCT/84-13, Roy Wilkins Medal, designs.

Mrs. Kohler introduced George Schafer from the Mint to show the members designs for these medals. Mr. Wiesel was honored for his role as "spiritual archivist of the Holocaust", and Mr. Wilkins for his significant contributions to the civil rights cause. Each had a portrait bust on the obverse; on the reverse of the Wilkins medal was a figure of Justice, holding a balance, while the reverse of the Wiesel medal showed an open book with a scene from his native city on one page and Jerusalem on the other. There were no objections to the designs, but it was pointed out that the lettering on the Wiesel medal should be the same on each side. Exhibit L

The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA O. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

EXHIBIT A

October 25, 1984

Dear Mr. Brodie:

It was a pleasure to meet with James Rich of your staff and Robert Smith, the architect for renovation of the Pennsylvania Building, during the Commission's October 16, 1984 meeting. The Commission approved the designs for adding to the top of the building and replacing the facade, with the understanding that the exterior material would be limestone similar in color to adjacent buildings. At some point the Commission should have material samples, including glass, submitted for approval by the architects. Because the building is in the Shipstead-Luce Act area, the actual building permit application process will include a review and approval by the Commission of the working drawings. Should there be any design refinement, or alternative studies, these could be submitted to the Commission either through the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation or the District of Columbia Permit Branch.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. J. Brodie
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corp.
425 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1148
Washington, D.C. 20004

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA O. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

EXHIBIT B

October 25, 1984

Dear Mr. Brodie:

The Commission of Fine Arts was happy to meet with James Rich of your staff and Bob Sprowls on October 16, 1984 and to approve final designs and materials for Indiana Plaza. Our one reservation was the actual cross-section of the bench, which may require additional shaping to provide a profile more in keeping with the surrounding detailing, and provide more comfortable seating at the same time. We would appreciate having the opportunity to review the actual resolution of that detail, but otherwise give the project our approval.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. J. Brodie
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corp.
425 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1148
Washington, D.C. 20004

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN G. CHASE
SONDRA O. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT C

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

October 25, 1984

Dear Dr. Robinson:

At its meeting on October 16, 1984, the Commission was pleased to see further detailed studies for Phase I of the Olmsted Walk modifications as well as preliminary plans for a new Gibbon Exhibit. I am happy to report that both of these projects have our conceptual approval, although we are withholding final action on the walkway designs pending the investigation of alternate paving materials.

The proposed use of asphalt paving for the major circulation of the Zoo is simply not appropriate for such important public space, where we recommend that a better quality, modular material, such as Hastings block, be used. This material is suitable for pedestrian use, and also will hold up well on surfaces used by service vehicles and other relatively heavy equipment; yet its appearance is superior to asphalt and also has the advantage of allowing repairs without the pathway taking on a "patched" look.

While we are on the subject of the Olmsted Walk, another point we would like to raise is the red brick line (currently painted) that extends from one end of the walk to the other. Its original purpose was to provide a reference point for pedestrians and thus afford a better comprehension of the Zoo's circulation. We believe that the improvements to the walk, that is the new paving and landscaping, as well as the exhibits themselves, will sufficiently identify this central circulation spine and make any additional identification unnecessary. The same might be said of the animal "foot prints" that are in widespread use throughout the Zoo. They probably are more confusing than helpful in guiding visitors, and they have a certain heavy-handed cuteness to them that does little to enhance one's visit. Eliminating the prints and the red line would be an improvement.

Though the Commission finds the concept of the Gibbon Exhibit compatible with the site, there was some confusion from the materials presented at our meeting as to how the structure related to the topography. If more detail and a model can be made available for our November 14 meeting, we should be able to complete our final review of that project as well as the first phase of the Olmsted Walk and enable you to proceed ahead on both.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Dr. Michael Robinson
Director
National Zoological Park
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D. C. 20008

+ Welcome aboard! We look forward to working with you -

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT D

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON — WALTER A. NETSCH
JOHN S. CHASE — ALAN R. NOVAK
SONDRA G. MYERS — EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

October 25, 1984

Dear Mr. Condayan:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on October 16, 1984, reviewed and approved designs for new planters that will act as security barriers at various entrances to the State Department Building. It is our understanding that the planters will be constructed of granite matching the base of the new wing, and that they be provided with no additional lighting.

We also discussed the possible need for additional security barriers at the corners of the building which may be vulnerable to high speed vehicles crossing at an intersection. In such situations, the Commission would like to suggest the use of closely planted trees rather than the continuation of more and more architectural barriers such as planters or bollards. Otherwise the building is likely to end up looking totally barricaded, which would be unfortunate.

We look forward to working with you on these additional problems.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. John Condayan
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Operations
U. S. Department of State
Room 1417, AOPR
2201 C Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20520

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT E

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

October 25, 1984

Dear Jack:

The Commission of Fine Arts met with John Parsons and Jeff Knoedler as well as representatives of WMATA and the District of Columbia Government, on October 16, 1984 to discuss the Anacostia Metro Station Parking Garage. The Commission was delighted to give the project concept approval with only minor recommendations. This is a unique opportunity for adding to the park system while providing structured parking for the Metro system, which we heartily endorse.

In approving the design of the building we caution that the design development should include user security, particularly in the stairwells. We look forward to reviewing the final working drawings as they are ready. The Commission also would condition its approval on the removal of the temporary surface parking on the site. This we understand is to be done when the line is extended beyond this station. In the meantime we are delighted that the public will have both this excellent parking facility and the addition of park lands along the Anacostia River.

Our understanding is that there may be some revisions to grades and flood protection coming from expected studies of the flood plain and existing conditions. We have every expectation that the outcome will be providential and that the park will become a suitable addition to Washington's waterfront park system.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Manus J. Fish
National Park Service
National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT F

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

October 25, 1984

Dear Jack:

The Commission was happy to meet with John Parsons and Joe Ronsisvalle of the National Park Service, along with landscape designer James von Sweden, during its meeting on October 16, 1984 to discuss additional studies for the German-American Garden on Constitution Avenue and the Washington Monument Grounds.

We were pleased to see that the project has been further reduced in size since our review in September. Of the two concepts submitted on the 16th, the Commission favors the off-set circular fountain scheme listed as Alternate VII. The Commission's acceptance of this concept is guarded, however. The issues include the selection of plant materials and a firm time-table for the removal of the existing curb-cut and surface parking.

Our approval of a garden at this location was granted in part by the assurances given this Agency that the existing parking facility would be eliminated upon completion of the garden. We realize that its completion could extend over a period of many years, thereby maintaining the unacceptable appearance of a parking lot compounded by the disagreeable reality of a public garden bisected by an asphalt driveway.

In establishing the character of the proposed garden, the Commission is adamant that the type and selection of both the plant and construction materials be compatible with the simple dignity of Constitution Avenue and the Washington Monument Grounds. In this respect, the Commission would disapprove the exotic plant selections, including ornamental grasses and field flowers, normally associated with the designers' work.

The Commission looks forward to the continued development of this project and offers to work closely with you towards securing the most satisfactory resolution.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Manus J. Fish
National Park Service
National Capital Region
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT G

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

October 25, 1984

Dear Jack:

The Commission was happy to meet with John Parsons and Joe Ronsisvalle of the National Park Service, Bob Carter of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, and Frederick Hart, the Vietnam Memorial sculptor on October 16, 1984, to discuss the sculpture and the pedestrian area chain fencing at the Memorial site.

The Commission is concerned about the final appearance of Mr. Hart's sculpture of the three soldiers. As described by the sculptor, and as was shown in photographs taken at the foundry last week by our staff, the statue is being finished with a patina that sharply distinguishes between the unclothed areas of the figures and the uniform materials and equipment. The uniforms are to be dull green, while the facial areas and arms are to have a dark brown polished surface. Other details, such as buttons, are to be left as polished natural bronze. All of this leads us to question the appropriateness of the effect that is likely to be achieved; an effect that as one member noted could be more suggestive of wax-museum figures than memorial sculpture.

I believe the best way to proceed at this time, however, is to allow the sculptor the opportunity to continue to experiment with the finish of the statue according to his own artistic preference. He is aware of the Commission's concerns and assured us he will bear them in mind in finishing the remaining work to be done.

Once the statue is finished, then we can reexamine the situation and determine if it is something we can all live with over the longer haul. If it turns out that we cannot, then it is a relatively minor matter to make modifications to the finished patina.

As to the chain fencing, the Commission regrets the necessity of having it at all, but when it is necessary, say, during wet months or periods of particularly heavy visitation, then the chain fencing that was previewed on the site the day before the meeting is an acceptable, if not ideal, solution.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Manus J. Fish
National Park Service
National Capital Region
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

EXHIBIT H

October 25, 1984

Dear Jack:

In addition to the regularly scheduled agenda items considered at our meeting on October 16, we were also asked by members of your staff about the placement of additional campaign names on the Iwo Jima Memorial.

We agree that the existing scheme of ringing the monument with a horizontal listing of the names of engagements be continued. The listings would be chronological in the manner of written text, i.e., from left to right.

Since the dates of the engagements are such an essential element, it is important that the inscription for Vietnam be consistent with other campaigns and not left undated. It is disturbing to see such a major conflict standing alone with no apparent beginning or end.

Thank you for the up-date.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Manus J. Fish
National Park Service
National Capital Parks
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

EXHIBIT I

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON — WALTER A. NETSCH
JOHN S. CHASE — ALAN R. NOVAK
SONDRA G. MYERS — EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

October 25, 1984

Dear Mr. Faught:

At its meeting on 16 October 1984 the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed plans for the addition of a covered walk between buildings 8 and 9 at the Marine Barracks.

There were no objections to the design of the covering, but the use of a non-transparent fiberglass material was thought to be unsuitable for these historic landmark buildings. It was recommended that a transparent or translucent glass be used instead, so that the quality of the material would correspond to that of the original work. A very low level of light, possibly along the edge of the floor, should keep the walkway from being too conspicuous at night.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. William D. Faught
Director, Installations Planning Division
Department of the Navy, Chesapeake Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Building 212, Washington Navy Command
Washington, D.C. 20374

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA O. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT J

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

October 25, 1984

Dear Mr. Faught:

The Commission of Fine Arts met with Mr. Gerlach on October 16, 1984 to review proposed designs for three projects at the Naval Research Laboratory: the Electro-Magnetic Development Laboratory, the Electro-Optics Laboratory, and the Mission Operations Support Center. The Commission had several specific recommendations about the individual projects but is withholding approval because of overall concerns about the post.

Since both the Naval Research Laboratory and the Bolling-Anacostia tract are major federal installations commanding a highly visible portion of the Capital's river frontage, we reiterate our past recommendation that your coordinated site and landscape plan for the entire post be submitted to this Commission and adhered to accordingly. Excellence in the general landscape design will be a solution to the present conflicting appearance of the various building groups; restricting parking from the river's edge is a mandatory part of that solution. Because of this, we are withholding our approval pending an opportunity to discuss specific resolutions with you.

Another general comment concerns the color palette for some of the structures which seem unnecessarily conspicuous. We should be happy to work together with you on the selection of materials for new construction and the repainting of existing structures.

As to the individual designs discussed, there was no objection to the proposed addition to the Electro-Magnetic Development Laboratory with the proviso that materials and details be consistent with the original building. Though there was no objection to the design of the Mission Operations Support Center, there is a very strong objection to having parking between it and the river. The red and white facade of the proposed Electro-Optics Laboratory is wholly inappropriate and should be restudied as a more subdued background industrial building.

The Commission's next scheduled meetings will be on November 14 and December 12. We would be happy to discuss these matters further at one of those times and our staff will be available in the meantime should there be any questions or assistance we can give you.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. William D. Faught
Director, Installations Planning Division
Department of the Navy, Chesapeake Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Building 212, Washington Navy Command
Washington, D. C. 20374

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA O. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT K

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

October 25, 1984

Dear Ms. Thompson:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on October 16, 1984, considered a conceptual design for a new semi-detached house to be constructed at 2809 'P' Street in Georgetown (O.G. 84-260). In addition to drawings and a model, the Commission was presented with testimony by the applicant, as well as by citizens opposed to the project.

After careful deliberation, the Commission unanimously voted to recommend against the proposed design. In the Commission's opinion, the new dwelling would adversely affect the setting of the house immediately to the west which has been free-standing on its site since it was constructed in the mid 1840's. The Commission believes that the special quality of that block, an unspoiled witness to the character of Georgetown of a century and a half ago, would be materially damaged by the introduction of the proposed structure.

The Commission suggested other options for building on the lot, involving a smaller dwelling behind that would be designed to afford greater respect to the site, the existing landscape elements and the adjoining structures.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Ms. Carol B. Thompson
Director
Department of Consumer &
Regulatory Affairs
614 H Street, N.W. - Room 307
Washington, D.C. 20001

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

EXHIBIT L

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

October 25, 1984

Dear Mrs. Pope:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed designs for the Elie Wiesel and Roy Wilkins medals at its 16 October 1984 meeting.

The obverse and reverse of both medals were approved, but it was pointed out that the lettering on the Wiesel medal should be carried out in the same style on both sides.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable
Donna Pope
Director
United States Mint
Department of the Treasury
Washington, D.C. 20220

EXHIBIT M

2809 P STREET

of the house and its height adjacent to open space, particularly to the east, and perhaps, also, to the west. There is a free standing house on the corner, with space all of the way around it, where, interestingly enough, approximately almost ten years ago the Commission recommended against construction of three new town houses. There is space here where once upon a time you recommended against a single new town house.

In an effort to comply with the Georgetown Board's concerns, the developer articulated this wall from a four inch reveal. The Board reviewed that on the 3rd and felt that it was the kind of response that would help mitigate the mass facing the east, and they have sent it on to you with their approval.

Subsequent to that there has been a good deal of interest in the project and how the mass relates to the unique entire block entire block core of the vicinity of 29th and Pennsylvania.

I have the developer here, Mr. Michael Minkoff. We have drawings prepared for the house, which we can go through as much as you want, and we also have some slides showing the context of the block.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Show the slides first, would you,

REPORTING CO., INC.
Street, N.E.
gton, D.C. 20002

please?

MR. MYER: I might note there are also some photographs on the table.

I am just showing you a few slides that really sets the context for the house. This is a pair of houses to the east or on the right as you see it on the model. This is the single house. That is the free standing house to the left on the model.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: What kind of tree is that to the right?

MR. MYER: I don't know.

This shows the block and the actual context related to and is the same as the model. There is a pair of existing houses, a garden adjacent here, which would not be affected by the proposal, and the side yard.

MR. NETSCH: The garden would not be affected by the proposal?

MR. MYER: There is a magnolia tree, for example, and an evergreen tree --

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Are they in the lot or in the garden of the adjacent house?

MR. MYER: This is in the garden of the adjacent house, very close to the drift line of the wall. This house

PORTING CO., INC.
et, N.E.

would become a partywall house for the proposed new house, which is this house on the model, and then, of course, the house on the corner. The retaining wall would be kept, with a new house entranceway through it, and the new house built ontop of the upper level, as you can see.

This is Michael Minkoff,the builder.

MR. MINKOFF: Don has pretty well covered what has transpired to date. We are trying to keep the new house here in line, as you can see. We discussed with the Georgetown Board some subtle deviations, with possibly a three foot setback of the house to make it less important than this house.

The exterior material would be identical in color and texture and it would be oversized brick laid with butt joints, which will be very difficult, and would be laid just like this house.

MR. NETSCH: Did I understand you to say oversized brick? Is the house next to it oversized brick?

MR. MINKOFF: No, it is not an oversized brick, but to match the brick we will purchase an oversized brick and have it resawn mechanically down to that size and lay it butt joined, and the roof material will be lead coated copper, standard seam.

REPORTING CO., INC.
Street, N.E.

MR. NETSCH: Let us hear everybody then before we comment.

MR. HARRIS: I am one of several neighbors. My name is Don Harris, and I live in this house, with my wife, and I apologize for having notes, but we heard about this only last Thursday. Nobody ever notified us before and I haven't had time to prepare what I want to say.

I object to the proposal for any house on this lot, and I would like to explain why I oppose any structure and then give you two technical grounds which I submit require the Commission to decline to approve any house.

I have several pictures I have taken myself. They don't add a lot to Mr. Myer's, but when I get to the end there will be some details he didn't show that I would like to refer to.

This whole block, the north side of P Street, between 28th and 29th, is a rarety. It is one of the few entire city blocks in the whole town that looks much as it did in 1843. It is 141 years that it has looked like that. It still has not been junked up and I am not suggesting this would be junk, but as yet these pre-Civil War houses have not been overwhelmed by buildings around here, which others have been subjected to in the past. This house is one of the

free houses, which I think is the Dodge family house, which was built something around 1800. All three of these houses were built in 1843 by Rubin Dowd.

I have a little paragraph of Rubin's history. It goes back to the War of 1812, and after the War of 1812 Benjamin Latrobe, who was commissioned to rebuild the Capital, he couldn't find any stonecutters. He went busily seeking around Europe and western England and one person he hired was Mr. Dowd, who came in 1817, and he brought with him his little boy, Rubin, who was then eight, and he lived in the old stonehouse for a time, and he started the other foundry, the one below Bridge Street in Georgetown.

The entire block, which is 28th and P, 29th and Q, was carved out of the rock of Dumbarton in 1804, and was sold by Thomas Bell to Mayor Lee, who was a long-time mayor of Georgetown and has his name on a lot of the buildings. He sold this block to the Dodges to build that house, and when he died he left the rest of this to his grandson, named Benjamin Rheingold. Someplace along the line somebody borrowed money from the Farmers Mechanics Bank and didn't repay it, so the bank sold these lots at auction in 1843 and he bought them and built the houses. Rubin Dowd,

REPORTING CO., INC.
treet, N.E.

he is the one who went to a surplus sale, again around 1843, right before the Mexican War, and he bought a whole bunch of rifles there, French rifles, a model the French sold to the revolutionaries, were used in the revolution, and they sold them to the U.S. for use in the War of 1812, and they were standard issue until prior to the Mexican War and they were declared surplus. From here to here around all three of these houses Rubin built a retaining wall and put a fence on top which is made out of these revolutionary rifles. He made the fence all of the way around. He went down to his foundry and made a strap that goes around them and had a beautiful continuous wall. That shows in one of my pictures, how there is this structure which is a famous rifle barrel fence.

All three of these houses are historic houses, and I think, in fact, the rifle barrel fence itself is an historic structure that shouldn't be tampered with. It may have a lot of rifles that came from Valley Forge.

I think that the block is very important and ought to be preserved in its present state. My wife and I agree with this strongly and we placed a restrictive covenant on our house thatprevents my doing with this 3,000 feet what they are trying to do here. It also preserves the pre-Civil

REPORTING CO., INC.
eet, N.E.
on, D.C. 20002

War facade. Mrs. Acheson has done the same thing here, so this corner is preserved.

Two technical reasons, and I have not heard these mentioned at all: First of all, 2011 P Street, which is right here, is not and was not built as a row house. This is not a case where Mr. A owns lot 1 and Mr. B owns lot 2, and Mr. A has built a row house and now Mr. B wants to. This isn't a row house. To the contrary. When Rubin Dowd built 2811 P Street, he placed a blank wall carefully on this wall and built a three-sided house. That east wall has four windows, windowsills, a door frame, a door a downspout, electrical fixtures, and walkway, and possibly other features, all of which would have to be removed to convert 2011 P Street into a row house. I submit that would be a substantial remodeling of an historic house, changing its appearance and feeling, and I do not think that is permissible, and I also suggest that would be a partial demolition of an historic house, because many of those features would have to be removed and destroyed, and I would suggest demolition is involved.

It also has to be noted from this that any structure here would have to make a partial demolition of that rifle barrel fence, which I think is an historic

structure, because there is no other access to P Street unless you tear down part of the fence.

A second reason, which is related, is this: The proposal assumes the existence of a separate walk there, and on paper that is true, but for 141 years there has been a de facto combination of these lots, because no one householder has confined himself to any single lot.

I can show you some of these features I was talking about. And the last thing will show you some of the overlap I was talking about. At the time Rubin Dowd built this house, there apparently was no requirement that you confine your structure to any single building lot, and the builder could build on everything as long as he owned it, and that is really what happened with all of these houses.

For example, in our house, this partywall between the two is very carefully on the line, but then there are two three-sided houses built here and there are a lot of things that overlap what really would be a separate line, and the same thing here is true. It is clear some of these features, as I was saying, would have to be demolished and removed, and encroach on what is alleged here to be a separate lot, and the only way you could get a separate lot, it seems to me, is by a back door subdivision, which would be a subdivision

EPORTING CO., INC.
et, N.E.

demolishment. You would have to demolish to make a party wall, to get rid of all of the enclosures.

You might note in the last picture I passed around the presenter has insisted we treat these as being the same block. You notice his mechanical and air conditioning is also clear over on his east wall, which would not be permitted under present regulations if those were two separate lo-s. You can't put the mechanical for one lot on a separate lot. So I guess my end request is that the Commission find that the building of any structure on the side yard of 2811 P is not permissible, would not be consistent with the purpose of historic preservation and would not protect the existing houses the way they are required to.

I also suggest, since there has been no movement in this direction, this Commission should call the Mayor's attention to the fact that this needs to go to the Historic Preservation Review Board because of substantial alterations that are required to 2811 P Street, and that Board, I think, would have to reject the proposal for the same reasons.

I have one final point, which is there is no way action I am requesting could be any economic hardship to the present owner of 2811.

EPORTING CO., INC.
et, N.W.

MR. NETSCH: I gather you did not testify before the Georgetown Board.

MR. HARRIS: I first heard about this on Thursday last. There apparently is no requirement that any builder notify the neighbors what is going on. I have talked to the owner of 2811 several times over the years and I have tried to persuade him to put a covenant on his house so we would have all of this area protected. About two months ago, which must be about the same time he initiated this project, the owner told my wife he had decided to put on a covenant.

MR. NETSCH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Could you explain your last remark, that it would not be an economic hardship?

MR. HARRIS: Two things: One is the owner is adequately endowed, has a profitable business, and the second thing is I think I could adduce some expert testimony that he is p-obably reducing the value of his house by more than he is making out of the whole project.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

MR. HARRIS: We have more neighbors that would like to speak. Thank you for listening.

MS. CHILD: My name is Ann Child. We live across

the street, at 2606 P Street, and I would just like to reiterate what Mr. Harris has said, that it is a significant neighborhood. We feel it is not a question of dealing with architecture of the new house,but preserving the unique quality of this particular block, which Mr. Harris explained to you. The unique quality is that we have open space between all of the existing buildings. Unlike virtually every other block in Georgetown, this one has three buildings, the one at the east end, an existing house; the center, and the one at the west, with open space in between them. What really is unique and historic about this whole situation is the site plan, and, obviously, any building here would alter that completely, so we would hope that youwould not permit an additional building to be built.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Anyone else that would like to testify?

MRS. ACHESON: Good morning. I am Mrs. Dean Acheson, and I live in this house. Let me point out that just yesterday I happened to be weeding in my garden and a purple grouse came and fed on dropped dogwood berries, and I watched him pleasantly for a half hour, and that is the kind of garden I have had for 62 years. My husband lived in that house for 50 years. Both of us have been members of the Citizens

EPORTING CO., INC.
eet, N.E.

Association, and I have been a member of the Georgetown Garden Club, and my husband helped found the National Foundation for Georgetown, and I think we both have worked quite hard to preserve the best of Georgetown, and I do think that this is just the sort of thing that this Commissio has probably been appointed to prohibit. I have every objection to it. I have been subjected to this builder's work for about a year and a half back in here, so that in going out of my yard we are interrupted and bothered by building going on for quite a long time, and I must say that the kind of building that I have seen done around there, they get permission to build a wall and build it illegally high by piling up some dirt for a few feet and measuring at that point, so you get a long, long wall with maybe 20 feet legal and 40 feet not. I should think that this definitely is not legal. And, also, they promised me that they would leave a little ditch so I could plant ivy against this wall that was built back of me by this builder. That has been called the Berlin Wall, rather sarcastically, in our neighborhood. And, of course, that was all filled up with cement, so that promise was not kept.

I would like to suggest that the builder here is killing the goose that laid the golden egg. They are fast

EPORTING CO., INC.
eet, N.E.

killing the goose and they are destroying the golden eggs. So I would say I am against it privately because it will spoil my life in that house there very distinctly, and I am against it publicly, as I think everybody is.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Anyone else want to testify?

MR. SHANNON: I just want to say something very quickly. Donald Shannon, past president of the Citizens Association. I think this illustrates exactly the problem we have now in Georgetown which is trying to preserve the green space, which is an important part of the village, as important as the buildings. The atmosphere of an historic district is determined not just by the bricks, but by the absence of bricks.

This block is one of the few that has been kept in its original state and I can guarantee you almost that if this were granted that the owner of the property on the corner will be in with a request in about five minutes for three houses on the extra space on that lot.

This is, I think, the kind of thing that really adds to the historic district. I think that the Commission should do everything possible to try to preserve this block and at the same time redouble the effort of keeping what is

left of the green space that is really a major characteristic of the Georgetown District. At this time this town was not just little houses built side by side. There was a lot more green space in this town before the sort of rehabilitation of Georgetown began in, say, the 1950s. There was a lot more green space, and it is disappearing, and I think the Commission has to take every opportunity to guard the green spaces that we have.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Does the builder want to make any rebuttal?

MR. MINKOFF: I want to just comment on Mr. Harris' issues. We intend to maintain the old stone wall and the gunstock barrel fence, with only one little three foot penetration in it. We have even tried to support maintaining a line of fence above the opening here, but there wouldn't be sufficient height to get under to get up the steps, and we would be willing to continue to support and try to keep that fence line uninterrupted.

This has been a subdivided lot as far back as any records in this office. Unlike the lots on the corner that are not individual lots, this is an individual lot.

Mr. Harris, I think, but I am not sure, maintained

there were several things that would be demolished on this side of the house. Number one, the doorway that goes into the, I guess, what would be the east side would be maintained by this little access easement that goes through to that doorway. There is no stoop. There is one little light fixture and two mail boxes. There is no demolition contemplated, and the two windows that would be closed up are windows that go into the stairwell. They are not required windows that go into any natural ventilation or light into any bedroom of the house.

As to the economics of this, I think I am a little more attuned to the economics than maybe Mr. Harris is, but this house currently is a two bedroom house and the owner is a salaried employee of a company, a major company, but one that doesn't make megabucks, but his intention is to put an addition on his house. His children are coming to live with him this fall. He has two teenage children that will be coming to live with him sometime this fall, so his intention is to put an addition on the house, to demolish all this stuff John Antonelli, the previous owner, put on to the house.

I think the wall Mrs. Acheson referred to, and this stuff put up without a permit, he is going to take all

of that down, and will go through proper channels to put an addition on his house.

MR. HARRIS: Any permit been requested for all of the alterations on 2811?

MR. MINKOFF: This is conceptual approval.

MR. HARRIS: I am referring to 2811.

MR. MINKOFF: There are no alterations to that house. We are not using a wall to attach to. We are building a new wall on the lot line.

MR.HARRIS; You are still going to close the two windows.

MR. MINKOFF: I think that might be a separate issue.

MR. HARRIS: No, because the approval of this design assumes what you are going to do at 2811 and I don't think this design should be approved if you can't do it without what you are doing to 2811.

MR. MINKOFF: Mr. Fahey approved the design, and as long as they are not required for light or ventilation, the can be closed.

MR. HARRIS: Not if you are altering an historic house.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: These questions that concern other

ORTING CO., INC.
N.E.

agencies are not properly within our purview,but I think as a Commission delegated under the law to administer the Old Georgetown Act, we have to look at this proposal on its merits, given the fact that we were appointed to do what we can to maintain the original character of Georgetown. Obviously the commercial sections of it, that character has been under severe alteration bit by bit, and we do what we can to try to balance out the commercial needs of the City and the flavor and character of those commercial areas.

When we get here into a residential street and we have an historic area that has been that way for that long, I think it is very much on our conscience to take a look at such a proposal on the merits.

I would be interested in hearing any views of the Commission.

MR. NETSCH: Well, I think it is unique that Georgetown has this open space, and I am chagrinned that there is this attack onthis marvelous block that has been for over a hundred years intact. The fact that it is legally a lot is, unfortunately, probably confusing to the esthetic goals and the legal realities, but I would like to speak to what I consider as rather callous of you, of the architects in their proposal. It would have seemed that

it would have been much more reasonable to have placed the house back of where Mrs. Acheson's backyard is and let all of these gardens remain and the open space remain on the street and that, in a sense, this new owner would have had a garden in front and the open space and the trees would have been preserved, and the garden adjacent to it, the trees adjacent to it would not have to be cut down because they would overlap into your property. It seems a rather insensitive architectural resolution, based on a theory that this is a row house block and confining the row house to the front, and I think that if there is to be a proposal here it should be much more sympathetic to the goals of the whole area and not what I am looking at here.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Mr. Novak.

MR. NOVAK: Walter has spoken from an architect's point of view, so I guess I would speak from a lawyer's point of view. You obviously have a collision between two important principles in America. One is that, generally speaking, a home owner, providing he complies with the laws and the rules, has a right to do certain things with his property. The other is that society and communities are also operating under laws creating certain restrictions with respect to things they want to preserve and protect, and

people's freedoms are restricted by those strictures. We aren't constituted to deal strictly either with legal questions of whether something is properly subdivided, or historic questions of whether or not he needs permission to remove a downspout. The responsibility of this Commission is more difficult to carry out, because it is more vague. In the exercise of discretion by all of us, we have to be very careful that we don't abuse that discretion. We just sort of have to get a feel for what we think our job is and what the job of the Commission is with respect to historic Georgetown, and I think it gets down to, it seems to me, and we have done it all of the time, where we sort of ask ourselves how special is this and what did the guy think he had a right to expect when he decided he was going to try and do something, and whereas I have a lot of respect and concern for an individual's right to do what he wants with his property, provided he acts within the law, I think in this case this block is fair warning, really, to people that it has been around so long, and this open space -- as a matter of fact, I looked at buying that middle house, the one adjoining the house to be built, and I looked at buying the Dodge house before I purchased the house I now have in Georgetown, so I do know that area, and that is a very special block. That is

REPORTING CO., INC.
reet, N.E.

why I was interested in purchasing it. It is hard for me to imagine that there wasn't some sort of fair warning to a homeowner that these spaces would not be easily relinquishe by the neighborhood or by our Commission.

I happen to agree with Mr. Shannon that Georgetown is increasingly threatened in all directions, and some of that may be all right -- it really depends on how special it is, and it seems to me this is one of the special blocks, and I would say that our jurisdiction extends to protecting the historic character of that block.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Any other comments.

MS. MYERS: Just to add to Alan's comments, given the lack of any compelling economic, social, or other reason for the community of Georgetown, rather than for an individual, I would tend to agree that we should maintain this block.

MR. STONE: I think the fact that the open space has historically existed for over a hundred years is a powerful persuasion that it should be left as is, and I concur with my colleagues.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: We have a tradition of not necessarily going along with the zoning parameters in any given space. There are many precedents where we have asked

EPORTING CO., INC.
et, N.E.

that height limitations, for example, be kept lower than what is permitted under zoning. So I think it is a question of, as Alan Novak said, caveat emptor, that the person who buys a lot like 2811 has to recognize, or who buys a house at 2811, has to recognize that the lot next door may have to come under this Commission's review and there is a risk that it not be allowed to be built on. So in terms of fairness, I think we are operating within our mandate, and my own view is that it should not be built on, and I think that is the consensus we seem to have here.

MR. NOVAK: Carter, one thing: I am not at all sure about the law or the tradition. There is a distinction between saying -- certainly it is an easier distinction for us to say what you designed is not what we think is okay for this historic district, and clearly we know that is our privilege. I think we run into more difficult ground when we say under no circumstances can anything be built there ever, because that is just a much more forceful statement of denial, and I think that it is clear that the Commission, I would say, unanimously agrees that what has been proposed is not appropriate. Perhaps that narrower ground leaves open a future question and puts us on a stronger basis.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: I think the consensus is clear and